

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:
SALA *et al.*

Appl. No. 10/046,724

Filed: January 17, 2002

**For: System and Method for a
Generalized Packet Header Suppression
Mechanism**

Confirmation No.: 2556

Art Unit: 2616

Examiner: Park, Jung H.

Atty. Docket: 1875.0710001

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Park for the telephone interview conducted on October 10, 2007. In the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representatives (the undersigned and Jamieson Fish) discussed (1) whether rejected claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-23 would be in condition for allowance if the Amendment and Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed September 12, 2007 ("Proposed Amendment") had been entered in the Advisory Action dated October 3, 2007, and (2) whether the finality of the Office Action dated April 12, 2007 was proper. The interview consisted of two phone conversations.

In the first phone conversation, the Examiner indicated that the entry of the Proposed Amendment would place the application in condition for allowance because the Proposed Amendment simply added already examined allowable subject matter from claim 24 to rejected claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-23. The Examiner and Applicants then discussed whether the finality of the Office Action dated April 12, 2007 was improper. The Examiner and Applicants agreed that it was likely that the Finality of the Office Action dated April 12,

SALA *et al.*

- 2 -

Appl. No. 10/046,724

Atty. Docket: 1875.0710001

2007 was improper. The Examiner and Applicants' representatives agreed that in view of the fact that the reply period expires on October 12, 2007, filing a petition to review the finality of the Office Action dated April 12, 2007 would not be an adequate option for the Applicants, as the response to the Petition would likely be received well after October 12, 2007. The Examiner and Applicants' representatives agreed that the best course of action would be for the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance. The Examiner said that a Notice of Allowance would be issued pending approval of his SPE and would call the Applicant's Representative's back after discussing the application with his SPE.

During the second phone conversation the Examiner indicated that his SPE determined that a Notice of Allowance should not be issued because the Finality of the Office Action dated April 12, 2007 was proper.

The Applicants respectfully request that the substance of the interview be recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Specht
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,463

Date: 10/12/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

732766_1.DOC